

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 2-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige in view of Richardson (“Richardson”, U.S. Patent Number 6,205,506). Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige and Richardson and further in view of Su et al. (“Su”, U.S. Patent Number 6,047,339). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige in view of Morris et al. (“Morris”, U.S. Patent Number 6,434,650). Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige and Morris in view of Daniel et al. (“Daniel”, U.S. Patent Number 5,726,985). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige and Morris in view of Su. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige and Morris in view of Blumenau (“Blumenau”, U.S. Patent Number 6,263,445). Claims 15 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige in view of Su. Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige and Su in view of Richardson. Claim 20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige and Su in view of Kang (“Kang”, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,133). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige, Su, and Kang in view of Blumenau. Claims 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagashige, Su, and Kang in view of Daniel. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

“To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. (emphasis added) *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

As indicated in the foregoing *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102* section, Nagashige fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the element of “bus operation

information structure,” as claimed in Claim 1. Furthermore, none of the foregoing references cited by the Patent Office teaches, discloses, or suggests the above-indicated claim element. Thus, independent Claim 1 is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2-14 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore nonobvious due to their dependence. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn, and Claims 2-14 should be allowed.

Independent Claim 15 recites “bus operation information structures.” For the reasons similar to Claim 1, independent Claim 15 is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 16-26 depend from Claim 15 and are therefore nonobvious due to their dependence. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn, and Claims 16-26 should be allowed.